



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,335	05/25/2001	Naomi Sugimoto	209045US2	2280
22850	7590	10/28/2003		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER PENDEGRASS, JOAN H	
			ART UNIT 2852	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/864,335

Applicant(s)

SUGIMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Joan Pendegrass

Art Unit

2852

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,8 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,8 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saijo et al. (US 4,825,241) in view of Shoji et al. (US 5,937,228). Saijo et al. discloses main pole N<sub>1</sub>, auxiliary pole S<sub>4</sub>, shortest distance between image carrier 100 and developer carrier 5,6 of 0.5 mm, column 5, line 31, shortest distance between image developer carrier and metering member 8 of 0.75 mm, column 5, line 33, and differs from the claimed invention in not disclosing the particular developing bias used. Shoji et al. discloses developing bias wherein an oscillation component occurs at least ten times during the period of time in which a given point of the image carrier is contacted by the magnetic brush because of the frequency of 2 kHz to 9.5 kHz, column 10, lines 20-26, and having an asymmetrical component reducing a period of time during which toner moves toward the image carrier, Figure 2, and column 10, lines 15-17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the bias of Shoji et al. with the magnetic brush developing device of Saijo et al. in order to develop uniform dots, Shoji et al., column 10, lines 15-19.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagao (US 5,991,586) in view of Shoji et al. (US 5,937,228). Nagao discloses image carrier 1, developer carrier 11,12, main pole N, auxiliary pole S, column 4, lines 1-8, a shortest distance

Art Unit: 2852

between the image carrier and developer carrier of .35 mm, column 6, line 27, and an amount of scooped up developer of  $4-6.5 \text{ mg/cm}^2$ , the ratio of which is less than 10, and differs from the claimed invention in the details of the developing bias. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the bias of Shoji et al. with the magnetic brush developing device of Nagao as explained in the rejection above.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,456,806 B2 in view of Shoji et al. The application claims differ from the patent claims in the details of the electric field (developing bias). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the bias of Shoji et al. as explained in the rejection above, as claim 4 of the patent suggests an oscillation component.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed August 19, 2003, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The superior results are not compared with the closest prior art and are not

Art Unit: 2852

unexpected in view of the teaching of Shoji et al. that when a narrow developing gap is used an AC bias (electric field with oscillation component) should be used to prevent blurring of the image trailing edge, prevent uneven line width and enhance image quality, Shoji et al., column 1, line 47, to column 2, line 13. Additionally, unexpected and superior results does not apply to an obvious type double patenting rejection.

### ***Final Rejection***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joan Pendegrass whose telephone number is 703-308-2796.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Arthur T Grimley can be reached on 703-308-1373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2852

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Joan Pendegrass', written in a cursive style.

Joan Pendegrass  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2852

jhp  
October 27, 2003